

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-23 and 25-36 were pending prior to this amendment. Please cancel claims 3-17, 19-23 and 25-36 without prejudice. Please add claims 37 – 64. Following entry of this amendment Claims 1 and 37-64 are pending.

Since all claims pending at the time of the Office Action except for Claim 1 (namely, Claims 3-17, 19-23 and 25-36) have been canceled, rejections relating to the canceled claims will not be discussed herein.

Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over William A. Barrett and Alan S. Cheney, Object-Based Image Editing (the “Barrett reference”) and further in view of Hirotada Ueda, Takafumi Miyatake and Satoshi Yoshizawa, An Interactive Natural-Motion-Picture Dedicated Multimedia Authoring System (the “Ueda reference”).

Brief Description of the Barrett Reference

The Barrett reference discloses a system for a user to directly and quickly manipulate a static digital photograph. One image (digital photograph) is selected. Then, individual image objects of the image, such as an arm or nose, are selected. New images can then be created from the selected image by editing (manipulating) the selected image objects, e.g., by scaling, stretching, bending, warping or deleting the selected image objects. The editing taught in the Barrett reference is performed on a single image.

The Claims are Patentable Over The Cited and Applied References

Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus that includes, *inter alia*, “a range designating unit adapted to designate a selected range of image data from an original range of image data comprising a plurality of images, the selected range of image data beginning with a start frame and ending with an

end frame; a trimming designating unit adapted to designate trimming areas of the start frame and/or the end frame; a generating unit adapted to extract the frames in the selected range of image data designated by said range designating unit, cut out the trimming areas of all the extracted frames based on the trimming areas of said start and/or end frames designated by said trimming designating unit, and generate continuous still images from the trimming areas cut out of the extracted frames; and an output control unit adapted to output the continuous still images generated by said generating unit.”

The claimed invention is directed to a plurality of continuous images. In contrast, as described above, the Barrett reference teaches editing of a single image. For example, in Figure 1 on page 777, five images are shown. As noted below the image, the first image (a) is the selected image. The second image (b) illustrates selection of objects within the image. The other three frames (c – e) “are edited version of *this* digital photo – *not* computer graphic models.” (emphasis in original). As is emphasized in the Barrett reference the editing is performed on a single digital photo.

Similarly, the other examples in the Barrett reference, e.g., Figs. 12 and 15 are directed to editing of a single image. In Fig. 12, a second image is generated from a first (original) image by stretching the hand in the first image. In Fig. 15, a first (original) image is edited to “paint out” a portion of the first image.

The Barrett reference does not teach or suggest any of the limitations in the claimed invention.

The Ueda reference does not remedy the deficiency of the Barrett reference not teaching any of the limitations of Claim 1.

Since the cited and applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 1, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited and applied references.

New Claim 37 is directed to an image processing apparatus and includes, *inter alia*, “an image designating unit adapted to designate continuous plural images from an original range of images comprising a plurality of images; a

trimming area determination unit adapted to determine trimming areas of at least two images from continuous plural images designated by the image designating unit; an area determination unit adapted to determine an area to be cut out of each of the continuous plural images designated by the image designating unit based on the trimming area determined by the trimming area determination unit; and a generating unit adapted to cut out the area determined by the area determination unit from each of the continuous plural images, and to generate a range of continuous images comprising the continuous plural images.”

As with Claim 1, new Claim 37 is directed to plural images. The cited and applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 37, therefore, Claim 37 is believed to be allowable over the cited and applied references.

Since independent Claim 37 is believed to be allowable, all of the claims depending therefrom, namely, Claims 38-64 are also believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

///

///

///

///

///

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

November 6, 2006

/Marlene Klein/

Date

Marlene Klein, Reg. No. 43,718
Attorney for Applicants

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3132
Fax: (949) 932-3560